UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,905	03/25/2004	Anson Horton	MS302711.01/MSFTP578US	7406

27195   7590   12/10/2008
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
127 Public Square
57th Floor, Key Tower
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER
SMITH, CHENECA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action ***Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief***	*10/808,905*	HORTON ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	CHENECA P. SMITH	2192	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>05 November 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

    a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

    b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

       Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

    (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

    (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

    (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

    (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

       NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

    Claim(s) allowed: _____.

    Claim(s) objected to: _____.

    Claim(s) rejected: *1-22*.

    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (SEE NOTES BELOW).

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

    /Tuan Q. Dam/
    Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments regarding claim 1 and similar claims 17 and 20-22 that "Bates is silent regarding wherein the attribute definition decalratively indicates how the debug information is presented in a devloper-customizable format, as claimed, and Bates_2 is incorrectly relied upon to overcome the deficiencies of Bates" and " the combination of Bates et al. and Bates_2 does not teach or suggest all claim limitations" (see pages 4 and 5), applicants should note where Bates discloses where an attribute defines whether a field is to be displayed (see page 6, paragraph [0064]: at step 614, the debugger determines whether any attributes are set for the variable; if any attributes you set for the variable, then processing proceeds to step 616 where the appropriate attribute indicator (e.g. G,S,I,R,C,P) for each set attribute is associated with the variable value and paragraph [0065]: that is, the debugger determines whether a field is to be displayed). Bates_2 was not relied upon to specifically teach an attribute definition. Rather, Bates_2 was cited to teach presenting debug information in a developer-customizable format, which he does teach where he recites a custom record display manager coupled to the user interface which receives user inputs and implements a custom record display function; the user interface responsive to the custom record display manager displays user selected customized record (see col.2 lines 8-12). Bates_2 also discloses where the custom record display manager 142 allows the user to program the user interface 136 to remember which fields of a given variable type or variable to be sent to the enhanced GUI 138 for display; then whenever a variable of the particular type or the record is encountered, the enhanced GUI 138 initially displays only the user selected or user programmed fields for the variable or the record. Therefore, Bates combined with Bates_2 fairly teaches or suggests the limitations of independent claim 1 and similar claims 17 and 20-22, as the combination would have been obvious in order to provide an improved debugger with an enhanced user interface that would display additional and more useful information to the user, as disclosed by Bates_2 (see col.1 lines 24-26).